Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheets include amendments to Figure 2. Applicant respectfully submits that Figure 2 has been amended to change the reference label 33 on the left hand side of the drawing to be reference label 39, corresponding to the first display message 39 of the specification. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment overcomes the objection to the drawings, and respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in substantially the same order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

Status of the Claims

Claims 6-13 are pending. Claims 1-5 are cancelled. Claims 6-13 are added. Support for the new claims is found in the specification.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1, 3, and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,209,076 to Kauffman et al. (hereinafter "Kauffman").

Claims 2 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kauffman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,448,982 to Klapper et al. (hereinafter "Klapper").

Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Kauffman. The Office Action rejected claims 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kauffman in view of Klapper. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections because claims 1-5 have been cancelled.

New Claims 6-13

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6-13 have been added. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 6 and 10 are patentable over the cited references because the cited references do not disclose all of the limitations of the claim. Claim 6 recites:

A method for monitoring a reciprocating compressor, comprising:

reading from sensors associated with the reciprocating compressor data corresponding to measured parameters relating to an operating state of the reciprocating compressor;

reading manually entered data corresponding to manually entered parameters relating to the operating state of the reciprocating compressor;

reading from a first database reference parameters, stored in the database, relating to the operating state of the reciprocating compressor;

performing a first comparison between the measured parameters, manually entered parameters, and the reference parameters;

performing a second comparison between the manually entered data and absolute values stored in the first database;

detecting whether an anomaly exists based on the first and second comparisons; and

if an anomaly is detected in the first and second comparisons, **performing a search in a second database to find a match of previously stored data correlated with predetermined anomalies and corresponding characteristics of the predetermined anomalies**, and sending a signal according to the match, the signal indicating characteristics of the detected anomaly of the operating state of the reciprocating compressor. (Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 requires performing a first comparison and a second comparison, and performing a search in a second database to find a match of previously stored data correlated with predetermined anomalies and corresponding characteristics of the predetermined anomalies. Kauffman fails to disclose at least these limitations of the claim.

Kauffman is directed to a microprocessor based device which monitors the operation of a compressor in refrigeration system and automatically shuts the compressor down if the monitored condition is abnormal. Kauffman, Abstract. Sensors in the refrigeration system since conditions such as refrigerant pressure superheat, oil pressure and motor draw. If a sensed condition is outside of the safety range and remains there for a time out period, an alarm condition is indicated and the device generates an alarm signal and shuts down the compressor. *Id.* More specifically, Kauffman discloses that the microprocessor makes use of sensors at selected locations in a refrigeration system, and that the high and low safety limits for the superheat of the particular refrigerant can be entered. If the actual superheat falls outside of the programmed safety range, the compressor is automatically shut off and alarm signals are generated to indicate the

presence of problem conditions. Kauffman, col. 1, line 64 to col. 2, line 6. Kaufman describes that a predetermined high limit for the current draw is established and may be entered into the EEPROM, and an amperes subroutine compares the amperage sensed by the sensors with the predetermined high amperage limit. If the amperage is less than the high limit, the high limit time value is set to a predetermined initial value, and a determination is made as to whether the time period established by the high limit timer has elapsed. If the high limit timer period has elapsed, the high amperage failure flag is set to indicate that a failure has occurred. Kauffman, Figure 4, col. 6, lines 10-29. Although Kauffman discloses comparing the amperage sensed by the sensors with predetermined high amperage limits, nothing in Kauffman discloses performing a first comparison between the measured parameters, manually entered parameters, and the reference parameters, and a second comparison between the manually entered data and absolute values stored in a first database.

Moreover, Kauffman fails to disclose performing a search in a second database to find a match of previously stored data correlated with predetermined anomalies and corresponding characteristics of the predetermined anomalies.

For the reasons stated above, Kauffman fails to disclose all of the limitations of claim 6. Given that the cited reference fails to disclose all of the limitations of the claim, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 6 is patentable over Kauffman.

Applicant respectfully submits that Klapper, which has been used by the Examiner to satisfy the subject matter of claims 2 and 4 regarding a matrix in which each row represents critical values, fails to cure the noted deficiencies of Kauffman. Given that the combination of cited references fails to disclose all of the limitations of the claim, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 6 is patentable over the combination of cited references. .

Given that claims 7-9 depend from independent claim 6, which is patentable over the cited reference, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 7-9 are also patentable over the cited reference.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is patentable over the cited references for similar reasons as described above with respect to claim 6. Also, given that claims 11-13 depend from independent claim 10, which is patentable over the cited reference,

Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 11-13 are also patentable over the cited reference. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6-13 are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the rejections and objections have been overcome. If the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Kevin Grange at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: Oct. 15, 2008

/Kevin O. Grange/

Kevin O. Grange
Reg. No. 60,793

Customer No. 8791
1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300